

REMARKS

Claim 1-40 are pending.

Claims 1-40 are rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 14, 18-22, 26, 28, 30-33, 36, 37 and 40 are amended herein. No new subject matter is added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Vallstrom et al. (U.S. 20040192352) in view of Alldredge (US 6,181,931).

The rejection is traversed.

Vallstrom describes a tracking device 10 “capable of bidirectional RF communication with a cellular network 12 via one or more base stations 14” (paragraph 29, lines 1-18).

Alldredge describes an address location system in which a communication satellite 106 communicates the position of a vehicle 108 to a network management facility 104 (column 4 lines 17-24 and FIG. 1).

Claim 1 is amended to recite a method for dynamic configuration of a mobile access point comprising:

- determining a position of said mobile access point, said mobile access point operable to provide a point of connection for wireless communications between a distributed computer network and a wireless client device;
- identifying a region based on said position;
- comparing said region with a previous position of said mobile access point to determine if said mobile access point has been moved to said region;
- automatically updating configuration information associated with an application of said mobile access point based on said region, wherein said configuration information enables transmission of a wireless communication from said wireless client device to said mobile access point within said region, and wherein said configuration information is different than a previous configuration associated with said previous position; and
- transmitting said wireless communication from said mobile access point to said distributed computer network.

As previously argued by Applicant, Vallstrom does not disclose a mobile access point. The Examiner acknowledges this at the top of page 3 of the September 21, 2007 Office Action and instead cites Alldredge as disclosing the mobile access point. Specifically, the Examiner

states that Alldredge discloses the mobile access point in claims 2 and 11. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 2 and 11 of Alldredge are directed to a pre-defined event which may include a change in assigned frequency to a mobile communication terminal (MCT). Applicant notes that the pre-defined event of claim 2 lacks antecedent basis in claim 1 so as to be rendered unintelligible. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to specify with sufficient particularity what in claim 11 is intended to disclose the mobile access point recited by Applicant's claim 1. Applicant assumes that Examiner intended to identify the MCT of claim 11 as disclosing a mobile access point.

The MCT of Alldredge is simply a transceiver that is attached to the vehicle 108 (col. 1 lines 59-61 and col. 4 lines 31-34). Whereas Alldredge separately identifies the MCT by reference number 110, this reference number is not identified in any of the drawings. In any event, Applicant understands that the MCT allows the vehicle 108 to remain in communication with the Network Management Facility 104. The MCT is not a mobile access point. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the features recited therein in order to facilitate prosecution. For example, the configuration information of claim 1 enables transmission of a wireless communication from a wireless client device to a mobile access point within a region. The MCT/vehicle of Alldredge is a wireless device; it does not communicate with a wireless client device. Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the wireless communication is transmitted from the mobile access point to a distributed computer network. The MCT/vehicle of Alldredge is in communication with the communications satellite 106, not with a distributed computer network.

The communications satellite 106 of Alldredge is also not a mobile access point. Although the communications satellite communicates with the MCT/vehicle 108 and the Network Management Facility 104, the satellite 106 not mobile. Applicant understands that conventional satellites orbit about the earth at a fixed position relative to a point on the ground. This is why satellite television, for example, is able to provide relatively uninterrupted programming 24 hours a day. Since the satellite 106 is not described as being mobile, it cannot disclose the further features of claim 1 including comparing a region with a previous position of said mobile access point to determine if said mobile access point has been moved to said region, wherein said configuration information is different than a previous configuration associated with said previous position. Because

the satellite 106 has a fixed position in orbit, Alldredge cannot be understood to disclose a previous position of the satellite 106.

Claims 2-10 are believed to be allowable as depending on claim 1 and as including further novel features recited therein. For example, amended claim 2 recites the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said mobile access point comprises a router configured to route a data packet from said wireless client device to a remote client device. The Examiner rejected original claim 2 according to the explanation that the location tracking device 10 is a router since it routes signals among different servers. Applicant respectfully disagrees. A router is defined by Wikipedia as a device that extracts the destination of a packet it receives, selects the best path to that destination, and forwards data packets to the next device along this path. By contrast, the location tracking device 10 merely transmits a signal to the nearest base station 14 that happens to intercept its signal. The tracking device is not selecting a path or extracting destination information. One skilled in the art would appreciate that the tracking device 10 of Vallstrom is incapable of performing as a router.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said configuration information comprises transmission configuration data and a selected user interface language, wherein said transmission configuration data and said selected user interface language are separately configurable for said region.

At least for the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10 is respectfully requested.

Previously presented claim 11 recites a mobile access point. As discussed above, neither Vallstrom nor Alldredge disclose a mobile access point operable to provide a point of connection for wireless communications between a distributed computer network and a wireless client device over a wireless connection. Therefore claim 11 is believed to be allowable for this reason alone, as well as the other novel features recited therein.

Claims 12, 14, 18-22, 26, 28, 30-33, 36, 37 and 40 are amended to include some of the same features as described above with respect to claims 1, 2 and 10, and are therefore believed to be allowable for the same or similar reasons as well as the further novel features recited therein.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-40 of the application as amended is requested. The examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Bryan Kirkpatrick". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Bryan D. Kirkpatrick

Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170